

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2023

by K E Down MA(Oxon) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16th August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/A5270/D/23/3323000

39 Court Farm Road, Northolt, UB5 5HQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Mansoor Fazil against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Ealing.
 - The application Ref 230329HH, dated 24 January 2023, was refused by notice dated 22 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is a single storey front/side extension; single storey rear extension, following demolition of existing garage; alteration to roof from hip to gable end; rear roof extension and installation of two roof lights to front roof slope; and removal of chimney stack.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to a single storey front/side extension; alteration to roof from hip to gable end; rear roof extension and installation of two roof lights to front roof slope; and removal of chimney stack.
2. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing garage at 39 Court Farm Road, Northolt, UB5 5HQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 230329HH, dated 24 January 2023 and the plans submitted with it so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted.

Main Issue

3. There is one main issue which is the effect of the side extensions and roof alterations on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair, the street scene of Court Farm Road and the surrounding area.

Reasons

4. The appeal dwelling is a traditional semi-detached house in a suburban street of similar properties set along a consistent building line. The street scene is well established and spacious with a regular pattern of buildings and gaps. Although house design varies there is a sense of consistency.
 5. The proposed single storey rear extension, which was substantially complete at the time of my site visit, is some 6.1m deep and occupies the full width of the dwelling. Nevertheless, I agree with the Council that it is very similar to the
-

extension deemed to be permitted development (Prior Approval not required) by notice dated 17 September 2021. I further agree that the effect of the extension, as built, would be similar to that of the permitted extension and that this element of the proposed development would be acceptable. I shall therefore restrict my further consideration to the side extension and roof alterations.

6. The original dwelling differs from the majority in the street in having a hipped roof that extends down and out over a side projection, to a lower eave on the side elevation set well back from the front elevation. The front door is in the front elevation of the side projection with an octagonal feature window under the sloping roof above.
7. A Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) was granted on 22 October 2021 for a rear and side roof extension and a front porch extension. However, what has been built deviates significantly from the lawful scheme and is now the subject of this appeal.
8. The single storey porch appears to have been constructed on the permitted footprint but the roof is noticeably higher. At roof level a hip to gable alteration has taken place over both the main roof and the side projection, with a ridge at the full height of the original roof. A rear dormer which extends to and is incorporated into the side elevation of the dwelling has been constructed and the original side projection has been extended up to second floor height with a small area of front facing pitched roof above. There are windows in the front facing elevation at both first and second floor height.
9. The proposed second floor and roof extension and alteration would, if allowed to remain, materially detract from the traditional character and appearance of the host dwelling and unbalance the semi-detached pair. The height and limited width of the side extension would make it a prominent, imposing and disproportionately tall structure which, owing to its height, would fail to be subordinate to the host dwelling. This would be emphasised by the second floor window which would draw the eye, and the small pitched roof above which would appear contrived, further emphasising the overall height and adding to the harm to the appearance of the dwelling.
10. The proposed rear dormer owing to its height and width would be a large, unsympathetic, boxy structure with a flat, full height roof. Its incorporation into the side elevation of the dwelling would lead to an incongruous and discordant profile that would be clearly visible in the street scene and surrounding area. Although the removal of the chimney from the rear roof slope would be acceptable in itself, it would enable the rear dormer to extend up to the shared boundary with the semi-detached pair, further emphasising its bulk and disproportionate size.
11. The appellant points out that there is a variety of property types and designs in Court Farm Road and that other hip to gable conversions with rear dormers are not uncommon. I would not disagree. However, a significant majority of the hip to gable alterations preserve a gable end, with the dormer being more discretely set in from the side elevation. Moreover, I did not see a hip to gable alteration of the type proposed, extending beyond the main side elevation of

the original dwelling, or on a dwelling with the characteristic side projection that is seen at the appeal property.

12. Whilst I accept that other hip to gable alterations unbalance their semi-detached pairs, the effect is less dissonant than the front facing, second floor extension proposed at the appeal dwelling. In the case of the LDC scheme, the hipped roof was preserved on the front and over part of the side elevation, noticeably limiting the loss of symmetry. Furthermore, I do not consider that the set-back materially reduces the prominence or incongruity of the additions although I accept that there are some angles from which they are hidden in the street scene by the host dwelling itself. Finally, the use of high quality materials would not compensate for or outweigh the poor design of the proposed extensions.
13. Overall, it is concluded on the main issue that the proposed side extensions and roof alterations would have a materially harmful effect on the character and appearance of the host dwelling, the semi-detached pair, the street scene of Court Farm Road and the surrounding area. In consequence, the side extensions and roof alterations would conflict with Policies D4 and D6 of the London Plan, 2021, Policies 7.4 and 7B of the Ealing Development Management DPD, 2013, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document: SPD4 Residential Extensions.
14. Taken together and amongst other things these policies expect new development to be of a high quality, sympathetic to local character, visually attractive as a result of good architecture and to result in an appropriate building pattern and scale. Specifically, in relation to roof extensions, dormer windows should be designed so they do not appear unduly obtrusive or dominant. They should respect the character of the original dwelling and should not take up the entire area of a roof slope.
15. Notwithstanding my conclusion relating to the side extensions and roof alterations, as set out in paragraph 5 above, I find the single storey rear extension acceptable. This part of the proposal is clearly severable from the side extensions and roof alterations and is physically and functionally independent of them. I therefore intend to issue a split decision in this case.
16. Since the single storey rear extension has been substantially completed, I do not consider that any planning conditions are necessary.
17. For the reasons set out above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed only in part but otherwise dismissed.

Karen Down
INSPECTOR